

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Applicants have amended Claim 19 to incorporate the limitations of canceled Claim 35. Accordingly, support for amended Claim 19 can be found in Claims 19 and 35, as previously presented. Claims 14 and 36 have been amended to depend from Claim 19. Support for amended Claims 14 and 36 can be found in the same claims, as previously presented. Applicants have also added new Claims 50-56. Support for new Claim 50 can be found in Claims 19 and 37, as previously presented. Support for new Claims 51-56 can be found in Claims 14 and 21-25, as previously presented. Claim 38 has been amended to depend from Claim 50. Support for amended Claim 38 can be found in the same claim, as previously presented.

No new matter has been added. Claims 14, 19, 21-25, 36, 38, and 50-56 are active in this application.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Decision on Appeal dated September 18, 2009, the Board:

(1) affirmed the rejection of Claims 11-14, 16-19, 21-26, 28-32, 39-46, 48, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,129,905 (Cutie) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,776,433 (Tzou et al.);

(2) reversed the rejection of Claims 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,129,905 (Cutie) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,776,433 (Tzou et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,558,651 (Riebe et al.); and

(3) affirmed the rejection of Claims 11-14, 16-19, 21-26, 28-32, 35-46, 48, and 49 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,223,381 (“the ‘381 patent”).

Applicants submit that, in view of the present amendments and remarks, all of the present claims are now allowable.

The rejection of Claims 11-14, 16-19, 21-26, 28-32, 39-46, 48, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,129,905 (Cutie) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,776,433 (Tzou et al.) has been obviated by amendment. As the Examiner will note, Claims 11-13, 16-18, 28-32, 39-46, 48, and 49 have been canceled, Claim 19 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 35, and Claim 14 has been amended to depend from Claim 19. Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 19 and the claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited art for the same reasons the Board reversed the rejection of Claim 35. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants have added a parallel set of claims (new Claims 50-56) in which independent Claim 50 corresponds to the combination of Claims 19 and 37. Applicants submit that Claim 50 and the claims dependent thereon are also patentable over the cited art for the same reasons the Board reversed the rejection of Claim 37.

The rejection of Claims 11-14, 16-19, 21-26, 28-32, 35-46, 48, and 49 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,223,381 ("the '381 patent") is being obviated by the filing herewith of a duly executed Terminal Disclaimer over the '381 patent. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.


Application No. 10/612,072

Reply to Decision on Appeal dated September 18, 2009

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stephen G. Baxter', is written over a horizontal line.

Stephen G. Baxter
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 32,884

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220